

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated October 12, 2005, the Examiner 1) rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; 2) rejected claims 1 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,062,464, issued to Peterson (hereinafter *Peterson*); and 3) indicated that claims 2-4 and 8 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and amended to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner objected to the terms "similar" and "corresponding." Claims 1-3 and 7 have been amended.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Peterson*. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). If a single element is not found in the prior art reference, the claims are not anticipated.

Claim 1 claims a plurality of similarly constructed trains of elongated members that are arranged to form a single pantograph forming longitudinally aligned rows of diamonds. The trains are spaced laterally to form a wall plane and oriented so that the diamonds of the pantographs operate in a plane at a 90° angle to that wall plane. Claim 1 also includes that Panels are secured to pairs of similarly located members in adjacent trains and to similarly located pairs of opposed sides of the diamonds.

In *Peterson*, the pantographs are formed with their members arranged to form diamonds (24) operating in a plane along the center line of the wall and not at a 90° angle thereto. In other words, the pantographs of claim 1 are 90° opposed to the pantographs of *Peterson*. The Examiner has erroneously considered panel support beams 32, 34 of *Peterson* to be the pantographs. Panel

Appln. No. 10/806,883
Amdt. Dated January 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 12, 2005

support beams 32, 34 are secured to specific points on the pantograph and provide for attachment of wall panels.

Therefore, *Peterson* does not teach diamonds of the pantographs that operate in a plane at a 90° angle to that wall plane. *Peterson* also does not teach panels are to similarly located pairs of opposed sides of the diamonds. Thus, *Peterson* can not anticipate the scope of claim 1. Claims 5-7 depend from claim 1 and are also not anticipated by *Peterson*.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview would be beneficial, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Derek V. Forinash
Reg. No. 47,231
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P.O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
(713) 238-8000 (Tel.)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT